



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,361	05/08/2001	Robert E. Novak	50588/22	2394
32641 7590 01/09/2008 DIGEO, INC C/O STOEL RIVES LLP 201 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SUITE 1100 ONE UTAH CENTER SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			EXAMINER PENG, FRED H	
			ART UNIT 2623	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/09/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/851,361

Applicant(s)

NOVAK, ROBERT E.

Examiner

Fred Peng

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-16, 18-20 and 30-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-16, 18-20 and 30-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/09/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on pages 12 and 13 of Remarks that Safadi is silent about using decoder 103 in FIG.1 to decode video streaming or web-cast data from DOCSIS tuner.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's arguments.

Safadi does disclose or suggest using decoder 103 in FIG.1 to decode video streaming or web data from DOCSIS tuner. Safadi first discloses one of the objects of this invention is to share the processing resource including decoding element (Para 19 lines 1-10), and further discloses using the decoder 103 to decode a stream video or web-cast video from the PVR and display it (Para 49).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-6, 8-16, 18-20, 30-31, 34-36 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Safadi et al (US 2005/0289617 A1).

Claims 1, 11, 30 and 31, Safadi discloses a set top box (STB) for decoding audio/video streams from multiple sources (Fig.1; Para 27), the STB comprising:

a processor (104);
a hardware decoder (103), coupled to the processor, for decoding audio/video streams;
a first stream receiver (202) configured to receive a first audio/video media stream from a first source (Para 37);
a second stream receiver (203) configured to receive a second audio/video stream from a second source, the second audio/video stream comprising Internet Protocol (IP) encapsulated...audio/video data, and the second source comprising an IP Source (Para 41); and
a stream selector (elements 104, 112) having first and second inputs and an output, the first input coupled to the first stream receiver, the second input coupled to the second stream receiver, and the output coupled to the hardware decoder, wherein the stream selector is configured to selectively direct one of the first audio/video stream and the second audio/video stream to the hardware decoder under control of the processor (CPU selectively controls the inputs to the output 103 for processing), and wherein the hardware decoder is configured to decode the selected output from the stream selector (Para 19 lines 4-7; Para 38 lines 6-8).

Claims 2 and 12, Safadi further discloses wherein the audio/video stream comprises a Moving Picture Experts Group (MPEG) stream (Para 47), and wherein the hardware decoder comprises an MPEG decoder (Fig.1, element 103).

Claims 3 and 13, Safadi further discloses wherein the first stream receiver comprises a video tuner (Fig.1, element 202).

Claims 4 and 14, Safadi further discloses wherein the first source comprises a cable television source (Fig. 1, element 204).

Claims 5, 6, 15 and 16, Safadi further discloses wherein the second stream receiver comprises a modem device/Data Over Cable Service Interface Specification (DOCSIS) modem (FIG.1, element 101).

Claims 8 and 18, Safadi further discloses wherein the stream selector (Fig.1) comprises a multiplexer (Elements 104, 112 act as a multiplexer to multiplex multiple inputs to an output such as TV output or PVR recording) having a select line coupled to the processor.

Claims 9 and 19, Safadi further discloses (Fig.1) an audio/video controller (element 103) coupled to the hardware decoder (103) for formatting media streams for presentation by an external display device (element 119; Para 38 lines 6-10); and

an output (103) coupled to the hardware decoder for providing operable connection to the external display device (inherently has an output coupled to the hardware decoder for connection to display device).

Claims 10 and 20, Safadi further discloses (Fig.1) a storage device (106), coupled to the processor, for storing at least one media of the first audio/video stream and the second audio/video stream.

Claim 34, Safadi further discloses wherein the decoder comprises a hardware-based decoder (Fig. 1, element 103).

Claim 35, Safadi further discloses wherein the multiplexed video signal and the streaming video signal are both encoded using a same technique (MPEG; Para 47), and wherein the decoder includes capability to decode signals encoded using the same technique (see Fig. 1 with MPEG decoder).

Claim 36, Safadi further discloses wherein the same technique comprises an MPEG encoding technique (MPEG; Para 47).

Claim 38, Safadi further discloses wherein the receiver is integrated with a set top box (Fig. 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 32, 33, 37 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Safadi et al (US 2005/0289617 A1).

Claim 32, Safadi is silent about comprising a radio-frequency input coupled to a splitter; and the splitter comprises a first output coupled to the first processing path and a second output coupled to the second processing path.

Official Note is taken that a splitter is well known in the art to split an input to multiple outputs for multiple input connections.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Safadi to have a splitter integrated within the receiver as a common and economical way to split signals to multiple destinations from a single source like cable.

Claim 33, Safadi further discloses a modem device/Data Over Cable Service Interface Specification (DOCSIS) modem (FIG.1, element 101).

Claim 37, Safadi does not clearly disclose wherein the same technique comprises a Digicypher encoding technique.

Official Notice is taken that video is compressed using various digital compression techniques, i.e., Digicypher, is well known in the art for compressed video and audio images to be transmitted over high bandwidth channels.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Safadi to encode data with Digicypher scheme so to take the advantage of transmitting compressed data over high-speed bandwidth channel, i.e., satellite beside of CATV network.

Claim 39, Safadi does not disclose wherein the receiver is integrated with a television set.

Official Notice is taken that integrating the receiver within a TV is well known in the art for simplification purpose.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate Safadi receiver within a TV so to reduce cost and simplify manufacturing process. Moreover, allow user to have a compact TV device.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fred Peng whose telephone number is (571) 270-1147. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 09:00-18:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on (571) 272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Fred Peng
Patent Examiner

Vivek Srivastava
Supervisory Patent Examiner



VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600